UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/584,406	10/20/2008	Claudiu Vasilescu	1200.758	9867	
Beranato, White	7590 06/22/201 ¹ e & Stavish	EXAMINER			
6550 Rock Spri		ANDREWS, MICHAEL			
Suite 240 Bethesda, MD 2	20817		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2834		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/22/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/584,406	VASILESCU, CLAUDIU	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	MICHAEL ANDREWS	2834	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>11 June 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavireal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
NOTICE OF APPEAL		en 1 141 1 4	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the company. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	, , , , ,	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/M. A./ Examiner, Art Unit 2834	/Quyen Leung/ SPE, Art Unit 2834		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's remarks present several arguments regarding the rejections presented in the Office action mailed April 16, 2010.

The Applicant's first argument (page 6, line 5 to page 7, line 2 of the Remarks) states that the sealing parts [36, 50] of Harris (US 5,793,143) are not axially inclined from the solid part as recited in claim 1. The Applicant argues that the definition of "inclined", "deviating in direction from the horizontal OR vertical", "clearly means that the inclined line or surface deviates from both horizontal AND vertical". Since the definition requires a deviation from either one or the other, the Applicant's allegation that deviation from both directions is required is not correct.

The Applicant's second argument (page 7, lines 3-4) states that Harris also does not disclose the sealing parts [36, 50] being in the form of thin tabs. No evidence, or arguments beyond this single statement, are presented and, therefore, this argument is unpersuasive.

The Applicant's third argument (page 7, lines 8-20) states that since the "axial reliefs" of Harris allegedly serve to fix the fans to the opposite magnet wheels, Harris does not disclose that they "serve as a fixing clip for the fan on the corresponding magnet wheel". However, "corresponding magnet wheel" is not defined by claim 5, or any claim on which it depends, as being a specific one of the magnet wheels. Thus, either one can be interpreted as the "corresponding" magnet wheel to which the axial reliefs fix the fan.

The Applicant's fourth argument (page 8, line 1 to page 9, line 3) states that claims 6, 7, 20, and 22 are not rendered obvious by their respective combinations of references because the combinations fail to disclose the same features presented in the previous arguments. Harris discloses these features, as stated above, making moot the arguments as to whether or not Vasilescu discloses these features.

Thus, the arguments presented are unpersuasive and the rejections presented in the previous Office action are maintained.